



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/122,576	07/24/1998	DANIEL V. SIEV	CVS-1	4548

20350 7590 10/17/2002

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
EIGHTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

EPPERSON, JON D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1639

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

File Copy

Application No.

09/122,576

Applicant(s)

SIEV ET AL.

Examiner

Jon D Epperson

Art Unit

1639

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-19,30 and 31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-19,30 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4. 6) ☐ Other:

### DETAILED ACTION

**Please note:** The Group and/or Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 1639. Please also note the change in Examiner.

#### *Continued Prosecution Application*

1. The request filed on July 30, 2001 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/122,576 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

#### *Election/Restriction*

2. Applicants' election of:

- [1] Group I, with traverse, claims 1, 6-19 and 30-31; and
- [2] resin species as indicated in Examples 2 and 3, wherein a resin of the claimed method is identified as "HCAM resin" or "hydrazyl-carbonyl-amino methylated polystyrene resin," such that in a derivatized resin of formula (I):

X = O

Y = -NH-

Z = absent

R4 = -NH<sub>2</sub>, i.e., -NH-R<sub>3</sub>,

"wherein R<sub>3</sub> is protecting group, provided that when R<sub>4</sub> is -NH-R<sub>3</sub> ..., then the protecting group is removed and replaced by -H in the final product" as indicated in Examples 2 and 3"

for examination purposes, is acknowledged.

Art Unit: 1639

Applicants' traversal was on that [1] an election had been made on the record of Group I, claims 1-27 and 29-31, as set forth in the May 9, 2000 Response; and that [2] that no serious search burden exists as the claimed invention included the same generically patentable concepts.

Applicants' arguments are found non-persuasive. It is maintained that: [1] Group I as elected in the May 9, 2000 Response contained different inventive concepts directed to different products and uses; such that [2] an undue search burden exists, because divergent searches requirements are required for the inventions encompassed by that group, because those inventions are classified in different classification and subclassifications. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made **FINAL**.

3. Claims 2-5, 9-14, 20-29 and 32-116 are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner under 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to non-elected inventions and/or species, the requirement traversed in Paper Nos. 9-10 and 12.

#### *Status of Claims*

4. Claims 1, 6-8, 15-19 and 30-31 are under examination in the current application.

#### *New Grounds of Rejection*

##### *Claim Objections*

5. Claim 31 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Art Unit: 1639

Claim 31 refers to “the method according to claim 30, wherein reactant (A) is selected from the group consisting of ...” However, claim 30 only refers to a method of claim 6, which refers to the substituent groups R and R2, respectively, which are selected from two separate lists of functional groups, while claim 6 directly refers to a “reactant (A)” as referred to in dependent claim 31. Applicants are requested to amend claim 30 to clarify proper claim dependency from claim 6.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1, 6-8, 15-19 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method for the production of

[a] a specific types of resin, i.e., a HCAM resin (see, instant specification, the use of which is exemplified in the instant specification by Examples 1-26, especially Examples 2 and 3)

[b] wherein said HCAM resin is associated or defined by:

[1] a derivatized resin of formula (I):

X = O

Y = -NH-

Z = absent

R4 = -NH<sub>2</sub>, i.e., -NH-R3,

“wherein R3 is a protecting group provided that when R4 is -NH-R3 ..., then the protecting group is removed and replaced by -H in the final product” as indicated in Examples 2 and 3; and

Art Unit: 1639

- [2] specific compositions attached to the HCAM resin as defined in the instant specification at page 34, lines 21-29 to page 35, lines 1-17)
- [3] the use of specific protecting groups (see, instant specification at page 28, lines 6-29 to page 30, lines 1-16)

for he claimed process, but does not reasonably provide enablement for all “methods for production of all derivatized resins encompassed by the definition of formula (I).” The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Factors considered in making such determinations are set forth in *In re Wands*, 858, F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed below, those factors include, but are not limited to, the: 91) breadth of the claims; (2) nature of the invention; (3) state of the prior art; 94) level of one of ordinary skill; (5) level of predictability in the art; (6) amount of direction provided by the inventor; (7) existence of working examples; and (8) quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention caused on the disclosure content.

In the present case, [1] the breadth of the claims encompass methods for production of a derivatized resin, which encompass amides (i.e., R4-NH-C(S)-Y-Z-SS, wherein X is S) and imines (i.e., R4-NH=C(N-R7)-Y-Z-SS, wherein X is N-R7). However, the examples in the specification teach the production and/or use of only amide based derivatized resins to yield positive or negative results (see, instant specification Examples 1-26, especially Examples 2 and 3 teaching a specific types of resin, i.e., a HCAM resin; at page 34, lines 21-29 to page 35, lines 1-17 and at page 28, lines 6-29 to page 30, lines 1-16); [2] the nature of the invention cannot be determined without knowing the exact components used in the method steps in the production of derivatized resins, other than components and method steps associated with the production of

Art Unit: 1639

amide based resins, i.e., such as thio-amides (i.e.,  $R_4-NH-C(S)-Y-Z-SS$ , wherein X is S) and imines (i.e.,  $R_4-NH=C(N-R_7)-Y-Z-SS$ , wherein X is N-R7) in the methods of the instant invention; [3] and [5] the state of the art and the level of predictability in the art cannot be predicted with any certainty as to how specific resins other than amide based resins, i.e., such as thio-amides (i.e.,  $R_4-NH-C(S)-Y-Z-SS$ , wherein x is S) and imines (i.e.,  $R_4-NH=C(N-R_7)-Y-Z-SS$ , wherein X is N-R7) can be produced and/or used for various solid phase synthesis as described in the instant specification and are likely to provide productive results beyond those methods taught for the production of amide based resins in the specification; [4] and [6] the inventor provides no guidance beyond the methods taught in the specification as previously mentioned. As a result one of ordinary skill in the art could not predict what components and alternate synthesis steps are necessary in the synthesis or production of resins other than amide based resins; and [7] and [8] while the existence of working examples are limited to Examples 1-26, especially Examples 2 and 3 teaching the synthesis of a specific amide based resin, i.e., a HCAM resin (at page 34, lines 21-29 to page 35, lines 1-17 and at page 28, lines 6-29 to page 30, lines 1-16), an indeterminate quantity of experimentation would be necessary to determine all potential and/or alternate types of method steps for the synthesis of derivatized resins, other than amide based resins, such as thio-amides (i.e.,  $R_4-NH-C(S)-Y-Z-SS$ , wherein X is S) and imines (i.e.,  $R_4-NH=C(N-R_7)-Y-Z-SS$ , wherein X is N-R7) could be produced by methods of the claimed invention.

In light of the preceding discussion, one skilled in the art could not practice the claimed invention without undue experimentation, as claims 1, 6-8, 15-19 and 30-31 fail to correlate reasonably with either the enabling disclosure of the specification.

Art Unit: 1639

8. Claims 1, 6-8, 15-19 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

9. Claim 1 is vague and indefinite in that it recites the following terms:

[1] in the preamble: “derivatized resin”; it is unclear what the aforementioned term refers to, as the metes and bounds of the aforementioned claim cannot be determined as the specification, claims and art do not recognize what the generic “derivatized” defines, as the claims fail to define what makes a resin derivatized; applicant is requested to point to where in the specification the term “derivatized resin” is defined and to clarify the aforementioned term and/or how a resin of the claimed invention is derivatized (i.e., what chemical functional group manipulations or transformations results in such a “derivatized resin”) to yield a derivatized product produced as a result of the claimed method;

[2] in the substituent definition section: [a] as associated with the term R4: “a protecting group” it is unclear what the aforementioned term refers to, as the metes and bounds of the aforementioned claim cannot be determined as the specification, claims and art do not recognize what the generic “protecting group” defines, as the claims fail to define what specific types of protecting groups are used in the production of a resin derivatized; applicant is requested to point to where in the specification the term is defined and to clarify what types of protecting groups are used in the production and/or synthesis of resins of the claimed invention [b] as associated with the term Z: [1]”a substituent selected from the group consisting of -NH-, -O-, -(C=O), -S-



Art Unit: 1639

,...alkyl, alkenyl... and combinations thereof”; it is unclear what the aforementioned term refers to, as the metes and bounds of the aforementioned claims cannot be determined as the specification, claims and art do not recognize what the aforementioned generic term define. For example, the element Z, which is a component of formula (I) of the claimed invention may be chosen from a series of terms, including a Markush groups of various components, but what constitutes “combinations thereof” of those chemical functional group moieties, how are each potential element, functional group or combination etc. linked to each other and with what types of chemical bonds form products and/or intermediates of the claimed invention. Applicants are requested to point to where in the specification the aforementioned terms and to clarify the claims accordingly; [2] the term “under conditions for peptide synthesis, functional groups of Z are protected”; it is unclear what the aforementioned term refers to, as the metes and bounds of the aforementioned claims cannot be determined as the specification, claims and art do not recognize what the aforementioned generic “conditions for peptide synthesis” define. For example, are such conditions for peptide synthesis referring to conventionally known organic chemical reaction conditions for attachment of conventional protecting groups used in peptide synthesis, such as FMOC, t-BOC, CBZ, etc. Applicants are requested to point to where in the specification the aforementioned terms and to clarify the claims accordingly.

10. Claim 1 recites the following limitations: [1] in the preamble: “the formula (I); [2] in step (I); “the product (I)””; and [3] in step (ii): “the derivatized resin (I).” There is insufficient antecedent basis for the aforementioned limitations.”

Art Unit: 1639

11. Claim 6 is vague and indefinite for the recitation of the following terms: [1] "R is a leaving group" and [2] "R2 is a leaving group, same or different than R1" it is unclear what the aforementioned terms refer to, as the metes and bounds of the aforementioned claims cannot be determined as the specification, claims and art do not recognize what the aforementioned generic term "leaving group" defines how a "leaving group" can be the "same or different than" relative to another leaving group without knowing what such groups are. Applicants are requested to point to where in the specification the aforementioned terms and to clarify the claims accordingly.;

12. Claim 15 is vague and indefinite for the recitation of the following terms: "R4 is converted to a reactive derivatized resin bearing a free amine by removal of R3."; it is unclear what the aforementioned term refers to, as the metes and bounds of the aforementioned claims cannot be determined as the specification, claims and art do not recognize what the aforementioned generic term "reactive" defines. For example, what constitutes a reactive derivatized resin from a non-reactive derivatized resin in the claimed invention, how are such resins transformed from "inactive" to "reactive and what chemical functional group moieties are converted to what other active functional groups, etc.?" Applicants are requested to point to where in the specification the aforementioned terms and to clarify the claims accordingly.

13. Claim 16 is vague and indefinite for the recitation of the following terms: "said reactive derivatized resin is contacted with an appropriately protected aldehyde or ketoamide to form a semicarbazone derivatized resin."; it is unclear what the aforementioned term refers to, as the

Art Unit: 1639

metes and bounds of the aforementioned claims cannot be determined as the specification, claims and art do not recognize what the aforementioned generic terms “reactive derivatized resin” and “appropriately protected aldehyde or ketoamide” defines. For example, what constitutes a “reactive derivatized resin” or an “appropriately protected aldehyde or ketoamide?” Applicants are requested to point to where in the specification the aforementioned terms and to clarify the claims accordingly.

14. Claim 18 is vague and indefinite for the recitation of the following phrases: “wherein said aldehyde is orthogonally protected.”; it is unclear what the aforementioned term refers to, as the metes and bounds of the aforementioned claims cannot be determined as the specification, claims and art do not recognize what the aforementioned generic term “orthogonally protected” in relation to aldehyde chemical group defines. For example, how is such an “aldehyde orthogonally protected”, i.e., what type of “protecting group,” and how is such an aldehyde protected “orthogonally” relative to what other chemical functional group moieties (i.e., what makes the protected aldehyde chemical conformation orthogonal in reference to neighboring functional groups?). Applicants are requested to point to where in the specification the aforementioned terms and to clarify the claims accordingly.

15. Claim 19 recites the following term or limitation: “said argininal guanidino side chain”; There is insufficient antecedent basis for the aforementioned limitation.

Art Unit: 1639

16. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. Steps are missing from the claimed method for producing a derivatized resin.

In particular, [a] how the starting material of formula (C) was assembled; [b] what is the order, connection or attachments or order of assembly for each of the elements, intermediates and/or components that form each intermediate and ultimate product in the synthetic construction of the starting material of formula (C) used in the method steps for production of a derivatized; and [c] in step (ii) by what steps is "recover" of the derivatized resin" accomplished. (See, instant specification at pages 14-19, especially page 16, lines 6-30 to page 19, lines 1-6, which includes within the four synthetic routes set forth for the production of derivatized resins of the claimed invention, synthetic steps for the formation for starting materials, such as those represented by formula (C) of the claimed invention.

Therefore, the metes and bounds of the aforementioned claims cannot be determined as the specification, claims and the art do not recognized a defined set of compounds, active sites or screening methods that define the above-identified generic terms.

### ***Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1639

17. The claimed invention is directed to a “method for production of a derivatized resin represented by formula (I) ... wherein said derivatized resin represented by formula (I) is prepared by a process, comprising the steps of (i) reacting a starting material represented by formula (C)  $R1-(C=X)-Y-Z-SS$ , wherein R1 is a leaving group with a reactant of formula (D)  $R4-NH_2$  to form the product (I) of formula  $R4-NH-(C=X)-Y-Z-SS$  and (ii) recovering the derivatized resin (I).

For this office action, the claim language has been interpreted based upon the transitional term “comprising”, i.e., wherein the open-ended term comprising, would include alternate method and corresponding steps resulting in the synthesis of such resins and associates intermediates and/or final products of the claimed invention.

18. Claims 1, 6-8, 15-19 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Galpin et al. (Peptides: Structure and Function: Proceedings of the Ninth American Peptide Symposium, 1985, Rockford, Illinois: Pierce Chemical Company, pages 799-802).

Galapin et al discloses: [1] methods for the preparation of derivatized semicarbazone resins (see, page 799, lines 15-24) for use in the solid phase synthesis of peptide aldehyde inhibitors; [2] wherein appropriate N terminal protected C-terminal aldehyde precursors or derivatives are linked or synthesized to form target peptides and/or corresponding libraries which are then anchored or condensed to a resin support via a semicarbazone linkage (i.e., an HCAM resin) and are subsequently cleaved via acidic hydrolysis; [3] wherein the synthesis incorporates conventional peptide chemical and solid phase synthesis techniques, such as deprotection, coupling, orthogonal side-chain reactions, etc., aforementioned aldehyde functionality or

Art Unit: 1639

functionalities are protected as stable, selectively cleavable semicarbazone species that preserves the chiral integrity of such precursors; [4] wherein said polymeric semicarbazide hydrochlorides are derived from poly[methylene(polyphenyl isocyanate)], comprising the steps of [a] reaction of the polymeric isocyanate with tert butyl carbazate to form a semicarbazide hydrochloride after the removal of the boc protecting group via acid hydrolysis (i.e., H-Cl/ethyl acetate), resulting in a highly cross-linked insoluble polymer; [b] to which was reacted a protected C-terminal protected aldehyde, such as a benzyloxycarbonyl phenyl alanine aldehyde in the presence of sodium acetate; [c] the peptide chain extension via coupling conventionally protected amino acids with conventional coupling techniques and reagents (such as DCCI/HOBt, see page 799, lines 10-14); [d] The protected dipeptide semicarbazone was isolated by a washing procedure allowing excess reagents and impurities to be removed from the resin bound protected dipeptide semicarbazone; or instead a repeating coupling steps to yield peptide sequences of different lengths, followed by cleavage of said sequence from the resin using an acid hydrolysis (see, page 801, lines 8-10); and [5] it was determined that an advantage of using a polymer bound semicarbazone in the synthesis of C-terminal protected peptide aldehyde inhibitors is that the protected amino acids are soluble in organic, dipolar aprotic solvents allowing facile precipitation by the addition of water or organic solvents such as ether, allowing purification by reprecipitation and washing (see, page 800, lines 6-10).

Therefore, Galpin et al anticipates the claimed invention.

19. Claims 1, 6-8, 15-19 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Murphy et al (J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1992, 114, 3156-3157).

Art Unit: 1639

Murphy et al discloses: [1] methods for the preparation of dramatized amino acid aldehyde semicarbazone resins (see col. 2, lines 39-40), comprising the synthesis of a resin product material, identified therein as peptide C-terminal aldehydes and corresponding derivatives or analogues, useful in automatable solid phase of peptide C-terminal aldehydes; [2] which represent "formidable synthetic targets due to their inherent chemical lability and their multifarious functionalities, which often require orthogonal protection with all the physical and chemical properties required for solid phase synthesis of peptides" (see, page 3157, col. 2, lines 8-9); [3] this method relies on the protection of an aldehyde as a function of a stereochemically stable semicarbazone; [4] this method involves the following general steps, i.e., the protected amino acid aldehyde semicarbazones are deprotected at the N-terminus and coupled with protected amino acids or protected peptides to give a protected peptide C-terminal semicarbazone. After the desired number of deprotection/coupling cycles are complete, the protected peptide semicarbazone is treated with aqueous acid/formaldehyde to regenerate the aldehyde and cleave it from the solid support. The resulting protected PA can then be deprotected if necessary (see, col. 2, lines 23-38); [5] wherein the method is exemplified according to Scheme I and those defined in Table 1, see col. 2 intermediate that involves the reaction of tert-butylcarbazate with carbonyldiimidazole in dimethylformamide followed by treatment with trans-4-(aminomethyl)cyclohexanecarboxylic acid benzyl ester, which was subsequently hydrogenated, treated with trifluoro acetic acid, reacted with a-Boc-N-L-argininal and base to yield the product identified therein as compound 4, which was subsequently coupled to a commercially available solid support resin, identified as an HBHA resin, which is used in the assembly of peptides using std. Boc protocols, and cleaved from the resin with dil. aq.

Art Unit: 1639

acid/formaldehyde to give protected peptide C-terminal aldehydes. Argininal-containing peptides aldehydes with various hydrogen/Pd labile protecting groups can be deprotected in a single step to give the unprotected peptide aldehydes after purification by reverse-phase HPLC. This preformed linker may be attached to resins, insoluble supports (as exemplified in compounds 8-11) that are suitable for use in conventional peptide synthesizers.

Therefore, Murphy et al anticipates the claimed inventions.

### *Status of Claims/Conclusion*

20. No claims are allowed. However, claims 6 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

21. This is a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/122,576. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

a. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the



Art Unit: 1639

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jon D. Epperson, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-2423. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:30 to 7:00 and alternate Fridays.

23. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Wang, can be reached on (703) 306-3217. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4242. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Jon D. Epperson, Ph.D.  
October 11, 2002

BENNETT CELSA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

